

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of:	Daniel Manhung Wong	)	Confirmation No.:	3803
		)		
Serial No.:	10/786,941	)	Examiner:	Pham, Michael
		)		
Filing Date:	February 24, 2004	)	Art Unit:	2167

For: Sending Control Information with Database Statement

---

VIA EFS WEB  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION**

Dear Sir/Madam:

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed July 21, 2010, the two-month period of reply for which runs until September 21, 2010.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections in the Final Office Action lack the necessary rational underpinning required by law. All pending claims recite a tag that “is **not embedded in said database statement**.” This feature is not shown by Puz, which states in paragraph 28: “The parse tree is analyzed and, for each database object involved in the query, an appropriate security marker is **inserted into the SQL string**.” Moreover, specific examples of tags that are not embedded in database statements are explicitly described at least in paragraphs 22, 33-34, and 37 of Applicant’s Specification as filed.

Each of the rejections in the Final Office Action is fully addressed below. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the erroneous rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH—WRITTEN DESCRIPTION**

Claims 1-26 were erroneously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The specification as filed explicitly describes the claimed subject matter in a way that reasonably conveys to a person of ordinary skill in the art